



# Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch  
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

## **DECISION**

Dispute Codes      OPR-DR, OPRM-DR, FFL

### Introduction

This matter proceeded by way of an *ex parte* Direct Request Proceeding, pursuant to section 55(4) of the *Residential Tenancy Act* (the *Act*), and dealt with an Application for Dispute Resolution by the landlords for an Order of Possession based on unpaid rent and a Monetary Order.

The landlords submitted a signed Proof of Service Notice of Direct Request Proceeding which declares that on April 29, 2021, the landlords sent the tenant the Notice of Direct Request Proceeding by registered mail to the rental unit. The landlords provided a copy of the Canada Post Customer Receipt containing the tracking number to confirm this mailing. Based on the written submissions of the landlords and in accordance with sections 89 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant is deemed to have been served with the Direct Request Proceeding documents on May 4, 2021, the fifth day after their registered mailing.

### Issue(s) to be Decided

Are the landlords entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent pursuant to sections 46 and 55 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to monetary compensation for unpaid rent pursuant to section 67 of the *Act*?

Are the landlords entitled to recover the filing fee for this application pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*?

### Background and Evidence

The landlords submitted the following relevant evidentiary material:

- A copy of a residential tenancy agreement which was signed by a landlord who is not one of the applicant and the tenant on May 30, 2019, indicating a monthly rent of \$1,100.00, due on the first day of each month for a tenancy commencing on June 1, 2019

- A copy of a property management contract showing the authorization of management responsibilities from the owners listed on the Application for Dispute Resolution to the landlords named in the tenancy agreement
- A copy of a 10 Day Notice to End Tenancy for Unpaid Rent (the 10 Day Notice) dated March 11, 2021, for \$6,505.94 in unpaid rent. The 10 Day Notice provides that the tenant had five days from the date of service to pay the rent in full or apply for Dispute Resolution or the tenancy would end on the stated effective vacancy date of March 21, 2021
- A copy of a witnessed Proof of Service Notice to End Tenancy form which indicates that the 10 Day Notice was posted to the tenant's door at 11:50 am on March 11, 2021
- A Direct Request Worksheet and ledgers showing the rent owing and paid during the relevant portion of this tenancy

### Analysis

I have reviewed all documentary evidence and I find that the tenant was obligated to pay the monthly rent in the amount of \$1,100.00, as per the tenancy agreement.

In accordance with sections 88 and 90 of the *Act*, I find that the tenant was deemed served with the 10 Day Notice on March 14, 2021, three days after its posting.

I accept the evidence before me that the tenant has failed to pay the rent owed in full within the five days granted under section 46(4) of the *Act* and did not dispute the 10 Day Notice within that five-day period.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the tenant is conclusively presumed under sections 46(5) and 53(2) of the *Act* to have accepted that the tenancy ended on the corrected effective date of the 10 Day Notice, March 24, 2021.

Therefore, I find that the landlords are entitled to an Order of Possession for unpaid rent as of the date of this application, April 15, 2021.

I note that the ledger includes arrears owing from August 2020 to October 2020, which includes affected rent for August 2020. The ledger indicates that payments were made on November 2, 2020, December 2, 2020, and December 9, 2020; however, I find the ledger does not clearly indicate whether the full affected rent for August 2020 was paid or whether only a portion of August 2020 was paid.

I also find that the amount of rent owing on the 10 Day Notice (\$6,505.94) does not match the monetary amount requested by the landlord (\$6,505.95).

For these reasons the landlords' application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent is dismissed, with leave to reapply.

As the landlords were partially successful in this application, I find that the landlords are entitled to recover the \$100.00 filing fee paid for this application.

### Conclusion

I grant an Order of Possession to the landlords effective **two days after service of this Order** on the tenant. Should the tenant fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed and enforced as an Order of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

Pursuant to section 72 of the *Act*, I grant the landlords a Monetary Order in the amount of \$100.00 for the recovery of the filing fee for this application. The landlords are provided with this Order in the above terms and the tenant must be served with **this Order** as soon as possible. Should the tenant fail to comply with this Order, this Order may be filed in the Small Claims Division of the Provincial Court and enforced as an Order of that Court.

I dismiss the landlords' application for a Monetary Order for unpaid rent with leave to reapply.

This decision is made on authority delegated to me by the Director of the Residential Tenancy Branch under Section 9.1(1) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*.

Dated: May 12, 2021

---

Residential Tenancy Branch